

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary  
Wednesday, September 3, 2014



A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Wednesday, September 3, 2014 in Conference Room 102-103.

In attendance were: **Chair Dan Hurt** (Ward III), **Councilmember Connie Fults** (Ward IV), **Councilmember Nancy Greenwood** (Ward I), and **Councilmember Elliot Grissom** (Ward II).

Also in attendance were: Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III); Councilmember Bruce DeGroot (Ward IV); Planning Commission Chair Mike Watson; Wendy Geckeler, Planning Commission Member; Merrell Hansen, Planning Commission Member; Michael Herring, City Administrator; Rob Heggie, City Attorney; Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Jessica Henry, Project Planner; and Kathy Juergens, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

### I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

#### A. Approval of the August 21, 2014 Committee Meeting Summary.

Councilmember Greenwood made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of August 21, 2014. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and passed by a voice vote of 4-0.

It was agreed to change the agenda order to begin with "New Business" first.

### III. NEW BUSINESS

#### A. Street Tree Replacement Program

#### STAFF REPORT

Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services, stated the Street Tree Replacement Program was established on an "as funds are available" basis. This year \$25,000 was funded for this program of which \$8,000 remains for the fall planting. We have received a substantial number of applications for fall planting, which if accepted, would cause us to exceed the budgetary allocation. Staff can process the applications on a first come, first served basis or if Council desires to fully fund the program, a budgetary adjustment of \$37,000 will be required. These trees are not discretionary replacements but rather replacement trees for trees that have been removed for various reasons.

## DISCUSSION

In response to Councilmember Greenwood's question, Mr. Geisel stated these replacements are not just for sweet gum trees that have been removed, but for all trees Citywide.

**Councilmember Grissom made a motion to forward this item to City Council with a recommendation to approve a budgetary adjustment of \$37,000 for the Street Tree Replacement Program's fall planting.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Greenwood and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Public Services, for additional information on the Street Tree Replacement Program.]**

## **II. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. Monarch Center, Lots A & B (Edison Express):** A Site Development Section Plan, Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Architectural Elevations, and Architect's Statement of Design for a 3.13 acre tract of land zoned "PC" Planned Commercial District located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Long Road and Edison Road.

## STAFF REPORT

Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, stated this project was presented at the August 21 Planning and Public Works Committee at which time a motion was passed to hold the project to allow the applicant time to address the concerns raised and to bring it back to the Committee at the next possible meeting once these concerns were addressed. The applicant has revised the plan to eliminate the third car wash lane.

## DISCUSSION

Chair Hurt informed the Committee that Councilmember Fults met with the developer to discuss concerns raised involving possible conflicts within the internal circulation and the right-turn in off Long Road. Councilmember Fults summarized that meeting noting that the applicant provided a solution to eliminate any internal circulation confusion by incorporating the use of striping and signage. With respect to relocating the drive-thru entrance, there is a concern with stacking of vehicles on the north-south main internal access road.

Councilmember Greenwood expressed serious concern about the internal traffic pattern and stacking for the drive-thru area.

Mr. Doug Shatto, Traffic Engineer with Lochmueller Group pointed out that movement in and out of the site is evenly dispersed between the three different access points – the right-in off Long Road, full access off of Long Road via the shared access driveway with Monarch Center, and the right-in/right-off of Edison. Therefore, all the traffic is not focused on any one movement. The largest focal point is the outbound movement at the shared access drive on Long Road because there are only two points of egress from the site.

Mr. Shatto discussed the validity of Councilmember Greenwood's concern with the entrance to the drive-thru possibly becoming blocked by vehicles waiting to turn left on the northern shared access drive and ultimately exiting the site onto Long Road. He then provided information on the estimated peak hourly volumes of traffic entering or exiting the site at each of the access

points and pointed out most of the expected volume is at the northern shared access which is still only 1 car every 30 seconds. Mr. Shatto did agree with Councilmember Greenwood's statement that surges in traffic will occur periodically for brief periods of time.

In an effort to address Councilmember Fults' concern with the traffic pattern and the potential for conflicts of opposing movements, Mr. Shatto presented an illustration that showed modifications to the internal site circulation and the utilization of pavement markings and "Do Not Enter" signage.

Councilmember Fults also discussed the requirement by City Ordinance to include trees in the island located off the right-in access road but noted that one of the trees in this area could present a sight distance issue. Mr. Shatto agreed that the tree located at the eastern end of the island could cause a sight distance obstruction and suggested the tree be relocated to the middle of the island or removed. Mr. Geisel, Director of Public Services, stated the City dictates the number of trees per the size of the island, but not the placement within the island so relocating or removing it as suggested should be acceptable.

Chair Hurt questioned the number of employee parking spaces being provided. Mr. Shatto indicated the site is probably over-parked but the number of spaces was dictated by current zoning ordinances and agreed the parking spaces could be utilized by customers.

**Councilmember Fults made a motion to forward the project to City Council with a recommendation to approve with the following restrictions depicted in a revised Site Development Section Plan:**

- **Restricted movement in the employee parking lot.**
- **Restricted movement near the Long Road entrance.**
- **Relocation/removal of the tree in the island.**
- **Restricted movement exiting the drive-thru.**

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and **passed by a voice vote of 3-1** with Councilmember Greenwood voting nay.

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, for additional information on Monarch Center.]**

**B. P.Z. 14-2014 City of Chesterfield (Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay District Updates):** An ordinance repealing Article 02 Section 04B.3 and Section 07 and Article 03 Section 05C and Section 08 of the City of Chesterfield Unified Development Code and replacing them with new sections to update development review process and standards for the Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay District

Aimee Nassif, Director of Planning and Development Services, stated that after receiving direction from the Planning and Public Works Committee, Staff met with the Ordinance Review Committee of the Planning Commission on necessary updates to the Wild Horse Overlay District, which was followed by a Public Hearing and vote by the Planning Commission on August 25.

The following modifications were recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee at their meeting of July 24, 2014:

- Elimination of the neighborhood office component so that only residential development is permitted.
- Strengthened language to eliminate the possibility of PUD Zoning.
- Codification of all standards and requirements.
- Strengthened the mitigation language.
- Clarification of development criteria.

In addition to the above modifications, the Planning Commission recommended the following amendments:

- Removal of the allowance for modifications to the performance standards and design criteria.
- Removal of the minimum average lot size requirement. (It was noted that the minimum lot size requirement still remains in effect.)
- Language requiring trails and sidewalks on all developments in the design criteria was amended to state that "... all development shall include sidewalks and/or trails."
- Language was added for additional vegetative screening when rear facades front Wild Horse Creek Road.

The Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the revised amendments. However, there was considerable discussion with respect to including existing language back into the updated draft which would allow for modification to the design criteria through a 2/3 vote of the Planning Commission.

## **PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT**

### **Sidewalks and Trails**

Planning Commission Chair Mike Watson stated the Planning Commission had extended conversations questioning the necessity of requiring both sidewalks and trails. It was agreed to modify the requirement to read "... shall include sidewalks and/or trails" so there would not be an overuse of either especially in the "knot" area and the area to the east of the bowtie area due to the smaller size of the lots in those areas.

### **Rear Facades Facing Wild Horse Creek Road**

Due to the street and sidewalk layout within the knot area and the eastern area, there was concern that developers would be forced to back the homes up to Wild Horse Creek Road in order to provide a common drive through the subdivision. Therefore, it was recommended that additional screening be provided to the rear facades facing Wild Horse Creek Road.

Councilmember Fults clarified that language had originally been added to the "Building Design" criteria of Table 1 requiring "rear and side facades to be designed with similar detailing and be compatible with the principal facades." This language had been added with the western side of the bowtie area in mind in anticipation of an internal roadway that would require the rear facades of homes to front Wild Horse Creek Road. It was never anticipated that there would be an internal roadway on the eastern side of the bowtie.

### **Noise Disclosure Requirement**

In response to Chair Hurt's question, Ms. Nassif confirmed there is still a noise disclosure requirement throughout the City to inform prospective home buyers of possible airport noise. This disclosure includes a noise level map.

### **1/2 Acre Zoning**

Councilmember Greenwood asked for clarification of allowing the possibility of 1/2 acre lots in the eastern portion of the bowtie when it is surrounded by 1 acre lots. Mr. Geisel explained those areas are rigidly restricted in terms of development. Since the bluff cannot be disturbed and the buffer off Wild Horse Creek Road has been increased, the building envelope has decreased. Rather than reduce the overall number of lots, additional lots are allowed within the smaller building envelope as a trade-off for preserving that property. Councilmember Fults further clarified that residents wanted any development off Wild Horse Creek Road to have a 50 foot buffer from the road in order to limit visibility from Wild Horse Creek Road, which further limits any type of development unless 1/2 acre lots are allowed.

Mr. Geisel stated the original study that is being proposed for revision had 1/2 acre minimum lot size with a condition to maintain a 22,000 sq. ft. average lot size, requiring half of the lots to be larger and half of them smaller. The Planning Commission recommended elimination of the minimum average lot size which grants them a 1/2 acre entitlement.

### **Super-Majority Vote**

Mr. Geisel pointed out that the current Ordinance allows for a modification of the performance standards and design criteria through a 2/3 vote of the Planning Commission. However, it has been recommended this language be removed. After discussion at Planning Commission, a motion to allow amendments to the design criteria failed by a 4-4 vote.

Councilmember Fults expressed concern that a developer could submit a proposal that does not meet all the design criteria but could still be approved. Her other concern related to a possible tear-down and re-build of a single home on a small lot where it would be difficult to meet all the performance standards. She suggested that a 2/3 vote of the Planning Commission be required to allow for modifications in such an instance. Ms. Nassif pointed out that lots having unusual conditions, such as size or shape, have the option of going before the Board of Adjustment for a variance.

If a 2/3 vote is allowed, Mr. Watson stated his concern is with a developer requesting a modification in order to put in more homes. He is not concerned with a single home. Mr. Geisel then explained that if an individual has a single-family home on an existing lot and wants to tear it down and rebuild, he is not required to rezone. He is able to rebuild under the current criteria. However, if the property is rezoned, he would be required to go to the Wild Horse Overlay.

Discussion then followed regarding the possibility of allowing modifications to the performance standards and design criteria through a super majority vote. Councilmember Fults still had concerns that a developer may be able to meet all the criteria for development except for one or two requirements in which case a modification could possibly be granted. Chair Hurt suggested allowing Council, rather than Planning Commission, to permit modifications to the performance standards and design criteria through a super-majority vote.

**Councilmember Fults made a motion to amend Article 03-05C of the Unified Development Code to state that a super majority vote of the City Council be allowed to approve any modifications to the performance standards and design criteria of the Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay District. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Greenwood and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.****

Discussion ensued on the possibility of changing the language to allow Planning Commission to have super-majority vote rather than Council. It was agreed that this subject may be re-visited at the next Council meeting.

### **Principal Facades**

Councilmember Fults stated her desire to have the principal façades be consistent with the character and materials of the surrounding neighborhoods. Ms. Nassif pointed out that this requirement is in two separate places in Article 04 of the Unified Development Code. It was also pointed out that the *principal facade* is defined as the main entrance area.

**Councilmember Fults made a motion to add additional language to the Building Design section of Article 03-05C regarding the standards of the Code.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

**Councilmember Fults made a motion to forward P.Z. 14-2014 Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay District, as amended, to City Council with a recommendation to approve.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Grissom and **passed by a voice vote of 4-0.**

**Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee, will be needed for the September 15, 2014 City Council Meeting. See Bill #**

**[Please see the attached report prepared by Aimee Nassif, Planning and Development Services Director, for additional information on Wild Horse Creek Road Overlay District.]**

## **IV. OTHER**

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.